



JAMES A. NOYES, Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

July 24, 2003

IN REPLY PLEASE

REFER TO FILE: **PD-3**

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**KENNETH HAHN PARK DRAIN PROJECT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND AUTHORITY TO PROCEED
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 2
3 VOTES**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for the proposed Kenneth Hahn Park Drain Project which includes constructing Kenneth Hahn Park Drain and reconstructing the existing La Cienega Drain in the unincorporated community of Baldwin Hills, concur that the project with the proposed mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County, and approve the Negative Declaration.
2. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure compliance with the project and conditions adopted to mitigate or avoid adverse effects on the environment.
3. Approve the project and authorize Public Works to carry out the project.
4. Find that the proposed project will have no adverse effect on wildlife resources and authorize Public Works to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The proposed project consists of replacing the existing La Cienega Drain's corrugated metal pipe with reinforced concrete pipe and constructing Kenneth Hahn Park Drain, a new reinforced concrete pipe low flow drain. Replacing the existing deteriorated corrugated metal pipe with reinforced concrete will maintain the existing level of protection to this drainage area and increase the service life of the system.

An environmental impact analysis/documentation is a California Environmental Quality Act requirement that is to be used in evaluating the environmental impacts of this project and should be considered in the approval of this project. As the project administrator, we are also the lead agency in terms of meeting the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Initial Study of Environmental Factors indicated that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, in accordance with the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines adopted by your Board on November 17, 1987, a Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This action is consistent with the County's Strategic Plan Goal of Service Excellence as this will allow us to improve and maintain a portion of the regional flood control system; thereby, improving the quality of life in the County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

There will be no impact to the County's General Fund. Sufficient funds for the proposed storm drain project costs are available to the Flood Control District.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, any lead agency preparing a Negative Declaration must provide a public notice within a reasonable period of time prior to certification of the Negative Declaration. To comply with this requirement, a Public Notice pursuant to Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code was published in the *Angeles Mesa Wave* on March 19, 2003. Copies of the Negative Declaration were

provided for public review to the Baldwin Hills Library. Notices regarding the availability of the Negative Declaration were also mailed to residents and property owners within the vicinity of the project.

The public review period for the Negative Declaration ended on April 21, 2003. Comments were received during the public review process from the California Department of Transportation. Responses to comments are included in Attachment B of the Negative Declaration.

Based upon the Initial Study of Environmental Factors, it was determined that the project with the proposed mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, approval of the Negative Declaration is requested at this time.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The California Environmental Quality Act requires public agency decision makers to document and consider the environmental implication of their action.

Mitigation measures have been included as part of the project. We have prepared the enclosed Reporting and Monitoring Program that include maintaining records to ensure compliance with environmental mitigation measures adopted as part of this project. Your Board is being asked to approve and authorize Public Works to carry out this project.

A fee must be paid to the State Department of Fish and Game when certain notices required by the California Environmental Quality Act are filed with the County Clerk. The County is exempt from paying this fee when the Board finds that a project will have no impact on wildlife resources. The Initial Study of Environmental Factors concluded that there will be no adverse effects on wildlife resources. Upon approval of the Negative Declaration by your Board, Public Works will file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk. A \$25 handling fee will be paid to the County Clerk for processing. We will also file a Notice of Determination in accordance with the requirements of Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The project will not have a significant impact on current flood control services or projects currently planned.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
July 24, 2003
Page 4

CONCLUSION

Please return one approved copy of this letter to Public Works.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. NOYES
Director of Public Works

MP:ph
C040080
P:\Pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Enviromental Unit\Projects\Kenneth Hahn Park Drain\Board Letter.doc

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office
County Counsel

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
KENNETH HAHN PARK DRAIN

I. Location and Brief Description

The proposed project is located in the County of Los Angeles unincorporated area of Baldwin Hills and consists of replacing the existing La Cienega Drain's corrugated metal pipe with reinforced concrete pipe and constructing a new reinforced concrete pipe low flow. Replacing the existing deteriorated corrugated metal pipe with long lasting reinforced concrete pipe will maintain the existing level of protection to this drainage area.

The existing La Cienega Drain consists of a main line, which collects flows from east of La Cienega Boulevard and conveys them to the Dabney Lloyd Catch Basin, and two laterals, which convey flows from RJ Lake and RU133 (see map) to the main line. The proposed project will replace the upper 380 feet of the main line, 280 feet of which will be tunneled under La Cienega Boulevard; replace the lateral from RJ Lake with a new pipe in a different alignment; and construct a low-flow drain to connect the upgraded main line with Lenawee Avenue Drainage Basin.

This low-flow diversion system will bypass a portion of the runoff from Kenneth Hahn Park into Lenawee Basin, causing low flows to bypass Dabney Lloyd Catch Basin, and is intended to reduce the occurrence of nuisance flows collecting in Dabney Lloyd Basin. The diversion structure will include an in-line water quality mitigation device to intercept any potential pollutants associated with low flows.

II. Mitigation Measures Included in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant environmental effects were identified. However, mitigation measures are discussed in Section XVIII of the Initial Study.

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Attach.

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title:** Kenneth Hahn Park Drain
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ms. Mercedes Passanisi, (626) 458-3915
4. **Project Location:** Unincorporated Los Angeles County Area of Baldwin Hills
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
6. **General Plan Designation:** Conservation/Maintenance
7. **Zoning:** Industrial Area
8. **Description of Project:** The proposed project is located in the County of Los Angeles unincorporated area of Baldwin Hills and consists of replacing the existing La Cienega Drain's corrugated metal pipe with reinforced concrete pipe and constructing a new reinforced concrete pipe low flow. Replacing the existing deteriorated corrugated metal pipe with long lasting reinforced concrete pipe will maintain the existing level of protection to this drainage area.

The existing La Cienega Drain consists of a main line, which collects flows from east of La Cienega Boulevard and conveys them to the DabneyLloyd Catch Basin, and two laterals, which convey flows from RJ Lake and RU133 (see map) to the main line. The proposed project will replace the upper 380 feet of the main line, 280 feet of which will be tunneled under La Cienega Boulevard; replace the lateral from RJ Lake with a new pipe in a different alignment; and construct a low-flow drain to connect the upgraded main line with Lenawee Avenue Drainage Basin.

This low-flow diversion system will bypass a portion of the runoff from Kenneth Hahn Park into Lenawee Basin, causing low flows to bypass DabneyLloyd Catch Basin, and is intended to reduce the occurrence of nuisance flows collecting in Dabney Lloyd

Basin. The diversion structure will include an in-line water quality mitigation device to intercept any potential pollutants associated with low flows.

9. **Surrounding Land Use and Settings:**

A. Project Site - Approximately 280 feet of the 60-inch RCP will be tunneled under La Cienega Boulevard, which is a local primary street and within Los Angeles County right of way. Although some work will be done at the existing inlet at Kenneth Hahn Park, the rest of the proposed project will be constructed on the west side of La Cienega Boulevard and will be located within the right of way of Stocker Resources, Inc.

B. Surrounding Properties - Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area is located on the east side of the project site. Landscaping in the area consists of grass, shrubs, and mature trees. Wildlife in the area is limited to domestic animals, birds, and insects.

10. **Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required (and Permits Needed):** Approval may be required from the Department of Parks and Recreation.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Mercedes Passanisi
Signature

Mercedes Passanisi
Printed Name

3/10/03
Date

LACDPW
For

STOCKER RESOURCES

LENAWEE AVENUE
DRAINAGE BASIN

Exist. City of
Culver City Drain
No. 5046-56 G

ATTACHMENT "C"

(Thomas Guide page 673-A3)

Proposed 24" RCP
Low Flow Diversion

Connect exist.
18" RCP
to 24" RCP

DABNEY
LLOYD
CATCH
BASIN

KENNETH HAHN PARK

CIENEGA

PLAN

NOT TO SCALE

DETAIL-3

Proposed 60" RCP

KENNETH HAHN PARK

RU133

STOCKER
RESOURCES R/W

STOCKER
RESOURCES

Proposed 42" RCP

Exist. La Cienega
Drain, 18" RCP

24" RCP
(1 cfs)
Exist. 60" RCP
Splitter
structure/
stormceptor

Proposed 60" RCP

RJ LAKE

DETAIL-3

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

KENNETH HAHN PARK
ALTERNATIVE CONCEP

J. KIM	D. STRINGER	06-13-0
DESIGNER	CHECKER	DATE

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
- 4) "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potential Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

KENNETH HAHN PARK DRAIN ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> - Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				X
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
II. <u>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</u> - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				X
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?				X
III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?				X
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
	b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
	f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
	iv)	Landslides?				X
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
	c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				X
	d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
	e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:						
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
	d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:						
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
	b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
	e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
	g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
	i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Physically divide an established community?				X
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:						
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X
XIII. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u> -					
	a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:			
		Fire protection?			X
		Police protection?			X
		Schools?			X
		Parks?			X
		Other public facilities?			X
XIV. <u>RECREATION</u> -					
	a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X
	b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X	
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?			X
	c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
	d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			X
	f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
	g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X
XVI. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
	b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
	c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
	g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -						
	a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
	b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively Considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS -

Section 15041 (a) of the State CEQA guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified. However, the following standard mitigation measures have been included:

Air Quality

- Compliance with applicable air pollution control regulations.

Noise

- Compliance with all applicable noise and ordinances during construction.
- Construction activities would be restricted to the County appointed construction times.

Transportation

- I. Advance notification of all street and/or lane closures and detours to all emergency service agencies and affected residents.
- II. Clear delineations and barricades to designate through traffic lanes.

P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Environmental Unit\Projects\Kenneth Hahn Park Drain\Initial Study.wpd

ATTACHMENT A
DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS
KENNETH HAHN PARK DRAIN

I. AESTHETICS - Would the proposal:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No impact. The proposed project involves the installation of concrete drain pipe. This area does not represent a unique scenic vista within the County of Los Angeles. Therefore, the project will have no impact on scenic vistas.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

No impact. The proposed project will not affect scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historical buildings within a State scenic highway. Thus, the project will have no impact on a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project involves the construction of reinforced concrete pipe. During construction, excavation, compaction, and backfilling of the soil would occur. These impacts will be temporary and only for the period of construction. Following completion of construction, any disturbed area will be restored to its original condition. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the visual character of the site.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No impact. The project would not require additional lighting systems. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on day or nighttime views in the area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to nonagricultural use?

No impact. The proposed project is located within an urban area. The project location is not used for agricultural purposes or as a farmland. The project will not convert any farmland to nonagricultural use. Thus, the project will have no impact on farmland.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with any existing zoning for agriculture or Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact related to a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or cancellation of Williamson Act contracts.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?

No impact. The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY - Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No impact. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The proposed project will not conflict with current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less than significant impact. Construction-related emissions and dust would be emitted during project construction. However, the effect would be temporary and would not significantly alter the ambient air quality of the area. Construction activities are anticipated to occur from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. The project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with applicable air pollution regulations. If the transportation of excess excavated material were necessary, the contractor would be required to cover the material with a tarp to reduce dust emissions and prevent falling debris. The impacts would be temporary and considered less than significant.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

No impact. The proposed project construction will not lead to emissions which exceed thresholds for ozone precursors. The project implementation would not

result in more vehicle trips. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to have no impact on ambient air quality.

d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Less than significant impact. No sensitive receptors such as churches or schools exist in the immediate area. However, areas within the immediate project location may be subjected to dust and construction equipment emissions during project construction. Project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means, such as sweeping and/or watering, and comply with all applicable air pollution control regulations. The impact is considered to be less than significant since the exposure would be temporary and precautions will be taken to mitigate exposure to pollutants.

e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less than significant impact. Objectionable odors may be generated from diesel trucks during construction activities. These types of odor would be short-term and temporary. Thus, the impact of creating objectionable odor is considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No impact. No sensitive or special status species as identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to exist at the project site. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on sensitive or special status species or their respective habitat.

b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No impact. The project would be constructed in an existing road right of way of Los Angeles County and Stocker Resources, Inc. No impacts to a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community would occur.

c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

No impact. The proposed project does not involve a wetland habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact wetland habitat.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

No impact. There are no known migratory wildlife corridors located at the proposed project location. Also, the project is not proposed within a watercourse or any body of water. Therefore, there will be no impact on resident or migratory fish or wildlife nursery sites.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

No impact. No known locally protected biological resources exist at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan?***

No impact. No known adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exist within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any of these plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

- a-d) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?***

No impact. No known paleontological, archaeological, or historical resources exist in the project area. However, if any cultural resources, including human remains, are discovered during construction, the contractor shall cease excavation and contact a specialist to examine the project sites as required by project specifications. Thus, the effects of the proposed project on these resources are not considered significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the proposal:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

No impact. There are no known active faults underlying the project site and a fault rupture is not anticipated to occur at the project site.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No impact. The proposed project requires some excavation of earth. However, project area has not been the epicenter of any known earthquake. Thus, the activities related to the project will not be impacted by seismic ground shaking.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No impact. The project area is not known to have suffered any liquefaction nor identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project will not be impacted by liquefaction.

iv) Landslides?

No impact. The project location is in a generally flat area. Thus, the proposed project will not be impacted by landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No impact. Construction of the proposed project would result in the disruption, excavation, displacement, and compaction of soil. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly compact the earth and properly dispose of any excess excavated materials. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on the loss of top soil or soil erosion.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

No impact. The proposed project site is not known to be on soil that is unstable. Project specifications will require the contractor to dispose of surplus materials in accordance to all applicable Federal, State, or local regulations. Thus, the project will not be impacted by unstable soil or geologic unit.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No impact. The soil at the project location is not considered expansive. Therefore, the proposed project will not be impacted by soil expansion.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No impact. There are no septic tanks or wastewater disposal pipes within the project scope. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the proposal:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

Less than significant impact. The soil excavated during installation of the storm drain will be monitored for contamination. Potentially contaminated soil will be segregated from clean soil and properly stored on site. In addition, potentially contaminated soil will be profiled by laboratory analyses. Contaminated soil will be transported by a State-Certified hazardous/nonhazardous waste hauler to a State-Certified soil recycling facility. Thus, the proposed project impact on the public or environment is considered less than significant.

- b-c) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Less than significant impact. Combustible engine fluids from the construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the spillage of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment at the project site. It is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances will occur as a result of the proposed project. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of any spills of fluids, the contractor is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanup and the nearby school officials would be notified of the spill and any precautions to be taken. Thus, the proposed project impact on the public or environment is considered less than significant.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

No impact. The project site is not known to be a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on hazardous materials.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project area is not within two miles of a public airport. The proposed project construction would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact relating to a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

No impact. Most of the project site is located off public roads. Construction done under La Cienega Boulevard will be accomplished by tunneling the culvert under the road surface, keeping equipment off the road. Once completed, the proposed project would neither generate vehicle trips nor affect traffic flows on roads in the vicinity. Therefore, there would be no impact on an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No impact. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to any significant risks involving wildland fires. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in adverse impacts related to risks associated with wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the proposal:

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is not anticipated to have an effect on the water quality standards or waste discharge requirements within a water body. The contractor is required to implement Best Management Practices as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to minimize construction impacts on water quality. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact on water quality.

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not involve the use of any water that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge.

- c) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

No impact. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. Therefore, the project will have no impact.

- d) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will alleviate the complaints from Stocker Resources, Inc., regarding the constant nuisance flows collected in their Dabney Lloyd Catch Basin. Therefore, the impact would be considered less than significant.

- e) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

No impact. The construction of the project will not result in additional surface water runoff. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the capacity of existing storm water drainage systems.

- f) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is designed to maintain the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Additionally, the proposed low-flow diversion structure will include an in-line water quality mitigation device, such as a stormceptor, which will help enhance water quality. The contractor will adhere to applicable Best Management Practices to minimize any degradation to water quality during construction. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the degradation of water quality.

- g) ***Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No impact. The proposed project will not create new housing so implementation of the proposed project will not place any housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- h) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No impact. The proposed project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which may impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, it will have no impact.

- i) ***Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

No impact. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding due to failure of a levee or dam.

- j) ***Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located in a coastal area that would be subject to inundation by seiche or a tsunami. The project is not within or adjacent to a hillside area and, therefore, not subject to mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Physically divide an established community?***

No impact. Because the proposed project consists only of an underground storm drain, it will not change community lines. Therefore, the project will have no impact on physically dividing an established community.

- b) ***Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

No impact. The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of the County of Los Angeles.

- c) ***Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project is located in an urbanized area of Baldwin Hills. No known unique, rare, or endangered species or animals exist in the project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted by any agency or community.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?***

No impact. The construction of the proposed project would not deplete any known mineral resources. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No impact. The project site is not identified as a mineral resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE - Would the proposal result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than significant impact. Noise levels within the proposed project site would increase during construction. However, the impact is temporary and will be subject to existing noise ordinances and standards set by U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The contractor will be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the County noise control ordinances. Noise levels due to vehicular operation along the roadway, when completed, will be no higher than current levels. The construction period will last for a short period, and the project would not expose people to severe noise levels. Thus, the proposed project impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Less than significant impact. Excavation and compaction during construction could cause limited temporary ground vibration. However, the project specifications would require the contractor to comply with all noise laws and ordinances. The project ground borne vibration and noise would be considered less than significant since construction would be for a short period and would not expose people to severe noise levels.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No impact. The proposed improvements will not add capacity to the roadway, nor will it increase the number of vehicle trips to the roadway. Therefore, no permanent increase to the ambient noise levels will occur as a result of this project.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than significant impact. During the construction phase of the project, there will be a nominal increase in existing noise levels due to construction and transportation of material to and from the project site. Due to the short-term nature of the project, the impact will be less than significant. Also, construction activities will be between 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

e-f) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No impact. The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact in exposing people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the proposal:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No impact. The purpose of the proposed project is to alleviate flooding in the immediate area. The project would not encourage population growth either directly or indirectly.

b-c) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No impact. The proposed project will not displace existing houses or people, which would create a demand for housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE - Would the proposal:

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?

No impact. The purpose of the proposed project is to alleviate flooding in the immediate area. Thus, the project will not induce development. As a result, the proposed project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. However, the County will coordinate with the police and fire departments regarding construction scheduling to prevent response time delays. Mitigation measures would require the road surfaces be returned to its original conditions.

XIV. RECREATION - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

No impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

- b) ***Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

No impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project may require disposal of excavated material and transportation of construction equipment to the project site. This could temporarily increase the existing traffic. This impact is temporary and only during construction and, therefore, is considered less than significant.

- b) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?***

No impact. The minor increase in traffic in the project area due to construction vehicles is temporary. Overall, the proposed project will not directly or indirectly cause traffic to exceed a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for roads or highways in the project area.

- c) ***Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?***

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

- d) ***Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not affect traffic flows or patterns. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on increasing a hazard due to a design feature.

- e) ***Result in inadequate emergency access?***

No impact. Most of the project site is located off public roads. Construction done under La Cienega Boulevard will be accomplished by jacking the culvert under the road surface, keeping equipment off the road. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact the emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- f) ***Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

No impact. There is no existing parking within the project area.

- g) ***Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB?***

No impact. The project will not result in contamination or increase discharge of wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB.

- b) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

- c) ***Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project is the construction of a stormwater drainage to provide increased flood protection. Impacts to storm water drainage would not be expected to occur.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water supplies. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water supply entitlements and resources.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

No impact. No increase in the amount of wastewater discharge will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment.

f-g) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No impact. The amount of solid waste generated will not be substantial. Project specifications will require the contractor to dispose of these materials in accordance to all applicable Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. The proposed project will not result in a facility that would generate solid waste. Therefore, the project will have no impact related to landfill capacity.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the proposal:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

No impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on plant community is considered to be none.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental

effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)

No impact. The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No impact. The proposed project would not have a direct or indirect detrimental environmental impact on human beings.

ATTACHMENT B

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

RECEIVED ON THE INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Presented below are responses to written comments received during circulation of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration regarding the proposed Kenneth Hahn Park Drain. Responses are provided to all comments that raise environmental issues, as required by the State of California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. Copies of the letters of comment are included on the following pages.

Response to letter of comment received from California Department of Transportation

- 1-1 The contractor will be required to obtain all necessary permits before construction of the proposed project begins. Large size truck trips will be limited as outlined in the Caltrans transportation permit, which will be obtained by the contractor.

Response to letter of comment received from Department of Toxic Substances Control

- 2-1 If field conditions indicate that contaminated soil potentially exists, Public Works will perform additional investigation and testing. Public Works will be the regulating authority in assessing, handling, storage, and disposal of impacted material in accordance with Federal, State, and local hazardous waste laws.

The Contractor shall be solely responsible for ensuring that all work performed under the Contract is performed in strict compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local occupational safety regulations. The Contractor shall provide at its expense all safeguards, safety devices, and protective equipment and shall take any and all actions appropriate to providing a safe project site.